

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated June 18, 2007. Enclosed in this response is a Request for a Continued Examination and a new set of claims. A new fee computation sheet is enclosed.

The present invention acknowledges the Wireless Application Protocol (WAP), which is the subject matter of Lee application. While Lee describes a system of thin client applications using WAP, the present invention advances the state of the art as follows:

In contrast to WAP, the Invention allows the storage of data primarily in servers in the Wide Area network and not in the handheld. Further it maintains a log of UI transactions on the server and replays that log. This new use and unique combination of technology is likely to make a complete range of applications possible and available that were previously not possible.

Specification at ¶ 0848. Further, Applicant acknowledges the WAP protocol as follows:

[0854] Associated with Compound requests is the notion of "OnAction" primitives which browsers use through scripting languages like European Association for Standardizing Information and Communication System (ECMA) Script. However, this is a new extension that is not available in X Windows that incorporates this into a graphics kernel whose application is based elsewhere. *In current mobile networks like WAP, the browser runs on the handset. However, this invention will allow the browser application itself to run on a Company's Server.* As a part of the application, the server sends "on action" requests on drawables that the client caches waiting for user actions. This new innovation brings additional capabilities.

[0855] The invention will decrease the bandwidth usage by maintaining drawable caches that can persist, such as visual objects and the ability to move them as well as the ability to do complex actions on drawables.

Specification at ¶ 0854-55 (Emphasis added). By the statement, "[i]n current mobile networks like WAP, the browser runs on the handset," Applicant acknowledges the existence of WAP protocol and that WAP-based browsers run on client computers. What Lee describes is WAP and not the advances in technology as described in the instant application. See Lee at Col. 11, lines 13-17, which states:

The Wireless Thin Client, 41, uses the Wireless Application Protocol or WAP to send and receive data to and from wireless device, 41. *The*

wireless device, 41, has a WAP browser to display the information.
Handheld devices as well as mobile phones may have a WAP browser.

(Emphasis added). Furthermore, Examiner is respectfully requested to note that this is a significant departure from the state of the art as it existed prior to filing the present application on May 22, 2001. Newly amended independent claim 1, which captures this concept, recites in part as follows:

wherein said display device is adapted to act as a remote output device for at least one client-side application programs running on said at least one remotely located server computer without the need for a virtual execution environment on the client computer

In view of this difference between the instantly presented claims and Lee, it is believed that the claims as presented are distinguishable over Lee. Reexamination is respectfully requested. A separate fee computation sheet is enclosed in duplicate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 17, 2007

Blair L (SARINA BHAMBOORAS)
for
NAREN CHAGANTI (44,602)
Naren Chaganti
713 The Hamptons Lane,
Town & Country, MO 63017
(650) 248-7011 phone

Attorney for the Applicant

Certificate of Mailing

I certify that on the date shown below I mailed this paper to:
Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313

Dated: September 17, 2007

Blair L (SARINA BHAMBOORAS)
for NAREN CHAGANTI
Naren Chaganti

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Bharadwaj

S.No. 09/863,425	ART UNIT: 2141
FILED: MAY 22, 2001	EXAMINER: KENNETH COULTER
TITLE: Remote displays in mobile communication networks	DOCKET NO: BHARADWAJ-001

FEE COMPUTATION SHEET

FOR	No. filed	No. Extra	Rate	Fee
Basic Fee (37 CFR § 1.16(a), (b), or (c))			\$150	
Search Fee (37 CFR § 1.16(k), (i), or (m))			\$250	
Examination Fee (37 CFR § 1.16(o), (p), or (q))			\$100	
Total Claims (37 CFR § 1.16(i))	36 minus 20	x 16	\$25	\$400
Independent Claims (37 CFR § 1.16(h))	3 minus 3	x 0	\$100	
Application Size Fee (37 CFR § 1.16(s))	If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper, the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) & 37 CFR § 1.16(s).			
Multiple Dependent Claim Present (37 CFR § 1.16(j))				
Request for Continued Examination Fee (37 CFR § 1.17(e))			\$395	\$395
	TOTAL			\$795

A check in the amount \$795 is enclosed herewith. Duplicate copies of this sheet are enclosed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 17, 2007

Naren Chaganti

for NAREN CHAGANTI (44,602)

Naren Chaganti
713 The Hamptons Lane,
Town & Country, MO 63017
(650) 248-7011 phone

Attorney for the Applicant